

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include the addition of Figures 1D – 1G.

Attachment: Four (4) Sheets of New Figures.

REMARKS

Claims 22 and 28 have been cancelled. Claims 1-21, 23-27, and 29-32 are pending.

Specification

The Specification has been amended to replace (in paragraphs [0028] and [0029]) references to Graphs 1-4 with references to Figures 1D-1G. The Specification has also been amended to remove the images and titles comprising Graphs 1-4. The subject matter of Graphs 1-4 now appears in newly added Figures 1D-1G.

Drawings

New Figures 1D-1G have been added. The information depicted in those figures originally appeared in the Specification as Graphs 1-4. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-21, 23-27, and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davenport (U.S. Pub No. 2003/0033236) in view of Li (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0004850) further in view of Bergstrom (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0156667). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has acknowledged on Page 4 of the Office Action that:

Davenport et al. do not teach buyer request for resource includes minimum desired quantity and maximum desired quantity, wherein the minimum and maximum are different.

The Examiner then states:

Li et al. teach buyer request for resource includes minimum desired quantity and maximum desired quantity, wherein the minimum and maximum are different (Li et al., Fig. 14, paragraph [0100]; where purchaser electronic procurement application for strategic sourcing include Minimum Desired Quantity, Maximum desired Quantity and Reserved Price for PEN 101 (#2 Pencils)).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Paragraph [0100] states, in its entirety:

[0100] The buyer can specify additional buyer constraints that will ultimately be communicated to the supplier on a dynamically generated web page. Examples of such additional buyer constraints include: a minimum or maximum quantity bid for a logical item, a preferred delivery date, and a reserved price, which is the maximum price the buyer is willing to pay, and a historical price. (emphasis added.)

Thus, Paragraph [0100] does not describe the claimed tolerance “that describes a minimum desired quantity and a maximum desired quantity of the resource.” Further, Paragraph [0100] also does not disclose that the “minimum and maximum are different.” Similarly, in Figure 14, only a “Minimum Desired Quantity” of 1,000 pencils appears to have been specified. No data appears next to “Maximum Desired Quantity.”


Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 16, 17, 21, and 27 are believed to be allowable. Claims 2-15 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. Claims 18-20 depend from Claim 17 and are therefore also believed to be allowable. Claims 23-26 depend from Claim 21 and are therefore also believed to be allowable. Claims 29-32 depend from Claim 27 and are therefore also believed to be allowable.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/28/10


Robyn Wagner
Registration No. 50,575
V 408-973-2596
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014